



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

2

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/668,399	09/23/2003	Yen Lu	CA920020042US1	4350
43307	7590	10/01/2007		
IBM CORP (AP) C/O AMY PATTILLO P. O. BOX 161327 AUSTIN, TX 78716			EXAMINER CAMPBELL, JOSHUA D	
			ART UNIT 2178	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/01/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/668,399

Applicant(s)

LU ET AL.

Examiner

Joshua D. Campbell

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 July 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 20-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 20-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed on 2/13/2007.
2. Claims 1-15 and 20-26 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 10, and 20 are independent claims. Claims 1-5, 10-15, 20, 21, 25, and 26 have been amended. Claims 18 and 19 have been cancelled.
3. The rejection of claims 10-15 under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. has been withdrawn due to amendments.
4. The rejection of claims 1-15 and 20-26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Martin et al. (US Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0036975, filed August 2, 2001) has been withdrawn due to amendments.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1-15 and 20-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin et al. (US Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0036975, filed August 2, 2001) in view of Bautista-Lloyd et al. (hereinafter Bautista-Lloyd, US Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0152239, published on October 17, 2002).

**Regarding independent claim 1**, Martin discloses defining a target frame within a web page adapted to serve as a work area for performing programming logic, the programming logic being associated with an action that is controlled by a trigger event and that targets the target frame (page 5, paragraph 0058-page 6, paragraph 0063 of Martin). Martin discloses that the logic is adapted specify the selected frames among a plurality of frames of the web page, not including the target frame, and reload only the selected frames regardless of their membership in framesets used to create the web page (page 5, paragraph 0058-page 6, paragraph 0063 of Martin). Martin does not disclose that at least one of the frames of the visible frameset that does not need to be refreshed is not included in the reload process. However, Bautista-Lloyd discloses selectively updating only the frames that need to be updated, thus excluding any frame in the visible frameset that does not need to be reloaded (page 1, paragraph 0007 of Bautista-Lloyd). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Martin with the teachings of

Bautista-Lloyd because it would have decreased the server load and network bandwidth by selectively updating only the frames that need to be updated.

**Regarding dependent claim 2**, Martin discloses that the web page is dynamic in nature and the content of the frames needs to be updated on reloading and refreshing (page 6, paragraph 0062 of Martin).

**Regarding dependent claim 3**, Martin does not disclose in response to a trigger event collecting and passing data in the form of a request to web server, to which a response of a script and the necessary data is passed back to the client and the script is executed to reload the selected frames properly. However, Bautista-Lloyd discloses in response to a trigger event collecting and passing data in the form of a request to web server, to which a response of a script and the necessary data is passed back to the client and the script is executed to reload the selected frames properly (page 4, paragraphs 0034-0037 of Bautista-Lloyd). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Martin with the teachings of Bautista-Lloyd because it would have decreased the server load and network bandwidth by selectively updating only the frames that need to be updated.

**Regarding dependent claim 4**, Martin discloses defining a frame of 0 rows and 0 columns at an edge of the web page (page 5, paragraph 0058-page 6, paragraph 0063 of Martin, the hidden updater frame is hidden so it has 0 rows and 0 columns).

**Regarding dependent claim 5**, Martin discloses using a first frameset tag in the web page to partition the web page into a main frameset comprising a plurality of

Art Unit: 2178

frames, and a separate target frame having the null dimension (page 5, paragraph 0058-page 6, paragraph 0063 of Martin).

**Regarding dependent claim 6**, Martin discloses reloading only the selected frames of the web page in dependence on a predefined set of conditions (page 5, paragraph 0058-page 6, paragraph 0063 of Martin).

**Regarding dependent claim 7**, Martin discloses accessing server-side functions in dependence on a predefined set of conditions, wherein the server-side functions return the programmed logic for directing client-side reloading of only the selected frames (page 5, paragraph 0058-page 6, paragraph 0063 of Martin).

**Regarding dependent claim 8**, Martin discloses associating said action with a link to a dynamic uniform resource locator, wherein said dynamic uniform resource locator directs access to said server-side functions (page 5, paragraph 0058-page 6, paragraph 0063 of Martin, a URL is provided since a webpage is being updated and a database is accessed to retrieve updated information).

**Regarding dependent claim 9**, Martin discloses providing a dynamic server page link (page 5, paragraph 0058-page 6, paragraph 0063 of Martin, a link is provided to the dynamic database so that information is retrieved from the database when an update has occurred).

**Regarding independent claim 10 and dependent claims 11-13**, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claims 1-4. Thus, the claims are rejected along the same rationale as claims 1-4.

**Regarding dependent claim 14,** Martin discloses the trigger comprises one of a link and a form that has the script as an action attribute and the target frame as a target attribute (page 5, paragraph 0058-page 6, paragraph 0063 of Martin).

**Regarding dependent claim 15,** Martin discloses the action attribute comprises a uniform resource locator (url) of a dynamic web page that includes the script and effects the downloading of the dynamic web page to the target frame, and the script with rendering information provides a set of instructions that include instructions for reloading only the respective selected frames, regardless of respective membership of the selected frames in framesets of the web page (page 5, paragraph 0058-page 6, paragraph 0063 of Martin, a URL is provided since a webpage is being updated and a database is accessed to retrieve updated information).

**Regarding independent claim 20 and dependent claims 21, 22, 25, and 26,** the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claims 1-3. Thus, the claims are rejected along the same rationale as claims 1-3.

**Regarding dependent claim 23,** Martin discloses the action is an attribute of one of the link and a form, and the event is a corresponding one of a selection of the link, and a submission of the form (page 5, paragraph 0058-page 6, paragraph 0063 of Martin, when the timer runs out and the Boolean flag is set to true, the link to the database is selected so that the information is retrieved and updated on the webpage).

**Regarding dependent claim 24,** Martin discloses the one of the link and the form has a target attribute set to the target frame (page 5, paragraph 0058-page 6, paragraph 0063 of Martin, the target attribute is set to the hidden updater frame

Art Unit: 2178

because when the timer runs out and the Boolean flag is set to true, the webpage is updated).

### ***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15 and 20-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

US Patent Number 7,177,918

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of



Art Unit: 2178

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua D. Campbell whose telephone number is (571) 272-4133. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30 AM - 4:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JDC  
September 24, 2007

  
STEPHEN HONG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

<b>Notice of References Cited</b>	Application/Control No. 10/668,399	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination LU ET AL.	
	Examiner Joshua D. Campbell	Art Unit 2178	Page 1 of 1

**U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS**

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
*	A	US-2002/0152239	10-2002	Bautista-Lloyd et al.	707/513
*	B	US-7,177,918	02-2007	Joshi et al.	709/219
	C	US-			
	D	US-			
	E	US-			
	F	US-			
	G	US-			
	H	US-			
	I	US-			
	J	US-			
	K	US-			
	L	US-			
	M	US-			

**FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS**

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N					
	O					
	P					
	Q					
	R					
	S					
	T					

**NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS**

*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
	U	
	V	
	W	
	X	

\*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).)  
Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.